

## Applicant Initiated Interview Summary

**Application No.: 10/701085****Applicant:** Dabney et. al.**Examiner:** Floschade Anderson**Art Unit:** 3623**Conf. #:** 4427**Status:** Final Rejection**Tentative Participants:****(1) Kevin Ransom (U.S. Counsel)****(2) Examiner Anderson****(3)****(4)****Date of Interview:** TBD**Type of Interview Requested:****(1) ☒ Telephonic****(2) ☐ Personal****(3) ☐ Video Conference****Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ YES ☒ NO**If yes, provide brief description:**

### Issues Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
Rejection	All	Cited prior art	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached**Substance of interview:** See Attached.

/W. Kevin Ransom/

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

W. Kevin Ransom

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

45,031

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

*If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.*

## Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

**Substance of Interview Request:**

The Office Action dated February 19, 2010 provides several proposed correlations between the *Island Data* reference and the claimed invention. Applicants seek to find clarifying language and/or arguments to distinguish the claimed invention from the *Island Data* and other cited references.

For example, in paragraph 8, the Office Action equates the customer service application of *Island Data* with the claimed content management system. Applicants respectfully submit that there is a significant difference between an online customer service system and a content management system that manages content that is published in a media such as on a web site. These systems are not equivalent. In paragraph 8, the Office Action alleges that it is obvious to route online submissions, but the key difference here is when routing occurs. In *Island Data* an online request is only routed when the user's question cannot be met by viewing online answers to frequently asked questions. In the claimed system, however, routing of an online submission is triggered when the online request is determined to include comments regarding published content. While the Office Action is possibly correct that theoretically the system of *Island Data* may forward online submissions that include comments regarding published content, there is nothing taught or suggested in *Island Data* that the inclusion of comments regarding published content can be the trigger for routing the online submission to an electronic content management system. The only triggering event that appears to be disclosed in *Island Data* is that the online submission by a user could not be answered by the "frequently asked questions" section. Using the fact that an online submission includes comments regarding published content as a triggering event for routing of the online submission is not taught, suggested, or even motivated by a reading of *Island Data*.

Claims 5 and 25 were also noted as of interest by Applicants. Claims 5 and 25 recite triggering monitoring a content accessing activity of a consumer based upon receiving a feedback message from the consumer. The monitoring is triggered based on the user providing feedback. While *Gardenswartz* discusses in general monitoring individuals using cookies, it nowhere teaches or suggests triggering the monitoring based first on receiving feedback from a consumer.